1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
2	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : Case No. 1:16-CR-075
4	vs. (Judge Kane)
5	CHRISTOPHER MARK HEATH, Defendant:
6	
7	TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL PROCEEDINGS VOLUME 3
8	PAGES 411 THROUGH 421
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE YVETTE KANE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
10	MAY 10, 2017; 11:30 A.M. HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
11	
12	FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
13	Meredith A. Taylor, Assistant United States Attorney Joseph J. Terz, Assistant United States Attorney
14	United States Attorney's Office 228 Walnut Street, Second Floor
15	Harrisburg, PA 17101
16	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
17	Lori J. Ulrich, Assistant Federal Public Defender Federal Public Defender's Office
18	100 Chestnut Street, Suite 306 Harrisburg, PA 17101
19	
20	
21	Lowi A Chuor
22	Lori A. Shuey Federal Certified Realtime Reporter
23	United States Courthouse 228 Walnut Street, P.O. Box 983
24	Harrisburg, PA 17108-0983 717-215-1270
25	lori_shuey@pamd.uscourts.gov Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

(Jury deliberates from 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.)

1.3

THE COURT: Good morning, counsel, jurors. Ms. Weida tells me there's a verdict. Would the foreperson tender the verdict slip, please. Ms. Weida, would you publish the verdict, please.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Count 1, conspiracy to manufacture, distribute, and possess with the intent to manufacture and distribute marijuana. On the charge of conspiracy to manufacture, distribute, and possess with the intent to manufacture and distribute marijuana, we, the jury, unanimously find Defendant Christopher Mark Heath guilty.

Do you unanimously find that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the weight of the mixture or substance containing marijuana in the conspiracy to manufacture, distribute, and possess with the intent to manufacture and distribute marijuana which you have found was 100 kilograms or more? Yes.

Count 2, on the charge of conspiracy to commit money laundering, we, the jury, unanimously find Defendant Christopher Mark Heath guilty.

Count 18, on the charge of manufacture, distribution, and possession with the intent to manufacture and distribute marijuana, we, the jury, unanimously find Defendant Christopher Mark Heath guilty.

On the charge of possession, use, and carrying a

firearm in furtherance of and during and in relation to a drug trafficking crime, we, the jury, unanimously find Defendant Christopher Mark Heath guilty.

Do you unanimously find that the government proved beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant Christopher Mark Heath either possessed a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime or used and carried a firearm during and in relation to a drug trafficking crime or both? The answer is possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime.

THE COURT: Counsel, do you wish to have the jury polled?

MS. ULRICH: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Jurors, this concludes your service to the Middle District of Pennsylvania. The lawyers and the parties are grateful for your attention and your participation. I excuse you now with the thanks of the court and the parties. Ms. Weida will escort you.

(Jury leaves courtroom.)

THE COURT: Counsel, I have a presentence report disclosure date of July 5th, 2017, and a suggested sentencing date of August 16th, 2017. Does that fit with counsel's calendars?

MS. ULRICH: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else for the

matter?

1.3

MS. TAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. In the indictment, there is a forfeiture count. I have had an opportunity to speak with defense counsel. I believe they are not contesting that for today's purposes, and we will file the preliminary motion with the court after today's proceeding.

THE COURT: Ms. Ulrich.

MS. ULRICH: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. Anything further?

MS. TAYLOR: In addition, Your Honor, we are asking that the defendant be remanded at this time given the jury's verdict. He is facing a five-year mandatory on Count 1 and a consecutive five-year mandatory on Count 19.

MS. ULRICH: Your Honor, Mr. Heath has been on pretrial supervision since March 24th of 2016 without a single violation. He's been living in Ohio with his wife, Tatum, and his two daughters, who are 14 and 8. He's very involved in their lives. He's a softball coach. They do a lot of other activities.

I actually have family members in the courtroom who can testify on his behalf, his mother, Lori Coogan, is here, his father Earl Heath is here, his stepmother Mary Heath is here. They all live in Ohio, I think within close proximity. In fact, the house they live in, 331 Park Avenue in Ohio, I think is owned by his mother and they rent from his mother.

Beyond that, Your Honor, he has a job. And, actually, I have an email from his employer. I don't have copies for everyone. It was an email from his employer, Jerry Pickens. He is working construction. He's working about 30 hours a week. He's renovating kitchens and bathrooms. He's been drug tested two times a month. I understand they've all been negative. He went to drug and alcohol counseling. He currently goes to psychological counseling.

1.3

He has a hearing in two weeks in California because there are pending charges out there that arose as a result of what happened here in Pennsylvania, so he needs to go to California to take care of that. I'll pass it up for the court.

THE COURT: What are the pending charges in California?

MS. ULRICH: They're gun charges out there, Your Honor, I think unlawful guns, possession of unlawful guns in California. Right? I don't know the exact charge.

THE DEFENDANT: It's possession of an unregistered assault weapon. It was a work weapon that wasn't correctly registered at the time when I was a peace officer, and I'm entering a guilty plea when I go there on that count, Your Honor.

MS. ULRICH: And, Your Honor, I would point out he hasn't missed a single hearing in this matter, and it's been

over a year that he's been on pretrial supervision. He's always appeared for all his hearings.

1.3

He doesn't have a prior record. This is a gentleman that there's no doubt in my mind will show up for sentencing and take whatever consequences that will flow from this case. But if the court wants, his mother and father are here and both ready and willing to testify on his behalf, if that's necessary.

MS. TAYLOR: Well, Your Honor, while all those arguments would be appropriate at an initial detention hearing and hearing from the defendant's parents might be appropriate there, unfortunately, the standard is different under Title 18, 3143(a)(2), and I believe that's what would control at this point now that the defendant has been convicted of these particular offenses. And that particular section indicates that the court shall remand the defendant unless certain things occur, and I don't believe those things are applicable here.

MS. ULRICH: The court has discretion, and they are applicable. And the court can consider all the factors I've just mentioned to this court, including the fact that all the co-defendants are out on bail, Tyler Long, Ramona Long, and Ryan Falsone. They're all out on bail.

Granted, they're not facing the five-year consecutive, but to me, it's all the same case. They're all out on bail.

He's been out on bail and has not violated this court's

confidence in any way, shape, or form. In fact, he's been going to counseling to try to deal with this. And he moved to Ohio to be closer to his family so he could set up his wife and children when he goes to jail.

THE COURT: Counsel, under the circumstances, I do believe that the defendant should be remanded. That is the standard. I don't find anything exceptional in the case that makes me comfortable that he is going to appear. He's convicted with two mandatory counts. That's not true for the co-defendants.

And I know that there were detention hearings, I believe before Judge Carlson, and that was his judgment, that they would remain at large. I don't know even what their status is at this point. Have they entered guilty pleas?

MS. TAYLOR: The co-defendants, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

1.3

MS. TAYLOR: They have.

THE COURT: All of the co-defendants?

MS. TAYLOR: All of them have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, the defendant, convicted at trial by a jury, should be remanded to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, should be remanded to the marshal, and that's my judgment.

MS. ULRICH: And that's fine. I understand. It's not so much that he had a jury trial, it's the fact that he's

convicted. I mean, even after a plea, they can be remanded, if they plead quilty.

THE COURT: Right. But obviously most of the time that doesn't occur.

MS. ULRICH: It doesn't occur.

THE COURT: And that's really on motion of the prosecutor. But there's a motion here of detention, and that's the standard, for there to be detention following a trial.

MS. ULRICH: But unless we establish by clear and convincing evidence that he's not a risk of flight or danger to the community, and that's what I've offered.

THE COURT: And obviously you convinced, I believe it was Judge Carlson of that pretrial, but circumstances are now changed, and now we have somebody who has been lawfully convicted.

MS. TAYLOR: Your Honor, just so the record is clear, the standard that Ms. Ulrich is articulating is not the standard, and I can read the entire section into the record if that's necessary.

But, you know, in order for Mr. Heath to be released, either the court has to find that there's a substantial likelihood that a motion for acquittal or a new trial will be granted or the attorney for the government has to recommend that no sentence of imprisonment is going to be imposed, and, and the court has to find by clear and convincing evidence that

the defendant is not likely to flee or pose a danger to the community.

1.3

So it can't just be a clear and convincing finding that he's not likely to flee. The government would have to recommend that we're not going to seek a sentence of imprisonment, and the court would have to make that clear and convincing finding because he's been found guilty of counts that call for a sentence of up to life imprisonment and a controlled substance offense with a ten-year maximum or more. That's what that section calls for.

MS. ULRICH: Your Honor has made the ruling. I'm not going to sit here and fight over it. But, you know, that would mean everybody that's convicted would be detained that's going to jail, and that doesn't happen. That tells me the court has some discretion. I just had a trial in March where Judge Rambo released a gentleman who was convicted right after trial, and he's not facing a probationary sentence, he's facing jail time.

THE COURT: I appreciate what you're saying, and I know that there are instances when the government doesn't object. And maybe that's what happened in the case that -
MS. ULRICH: No, the government wanted him detained.

THE COURT: All right. Well, without knowing the circumstances of that case, I'm just going to assume that Judge Rambo exercised good judgment under all of the circumstances.

MS. ULRICH: She did.

THE COURT: But I think in this case, everything 1 points to detention. And if it will help you, we'll work with 2 you on the sentencing date. The proposed date is August 16th, 3 but if you want to move that up and we can accomplish that for 4 you, we'll make that happen. 5 6 MS. ULRICH: Just for the record, and I just want to 7 put this on the record in case -- to preserve it. I'm moving for judgment of acquittal notwithstanding the verdict on 8 9 possession in furtherance of -- possession of the firearm in furtherance of drug trafficking. 10 11 12 1.3 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I do that because I think then we don't have to do post-trials on sufficiency. Just as a cautionary, I just want to put that I am moving for a judgment of acquittal notwithstanding the verdict on the possession of the firearm in furtherance of drug trafficking.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you going to supplement that with any sort of written --

MS. ULRICH: Well, I guess if the court is not going to rule on it, then I probably would have to do post-trials.

THE COURT: I'm happy to rule on it now, unless you're telling me you have a submission that you want to make.

MS. ULRICH: No, I'm expecting you to rule on it now, actually.

THE COURT: The motion is denied. All right. Is there anything else for the record?

```
MS. TAYLOR: Not from the government, Your Honor.
 1
     Thank you.
 2
               THE COURT: Ms. Ulrich?
 3
              MS. ULRICH: I have nothing else.
 4
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel.
 5
              MS. TAYLOR: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
7
          (Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned at 11:45 a.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

I, Lori A. Shuey, Federal Certified Realtime Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-captioned matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Dated in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, this 18th day of December, 2017.

/s/ Lori A. Shuey

Lori A. Shuey

Federal Certified Realtime Reporter